

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,292	02/18/2004		James D. Ralph	F-199 CON I	6146
36402	7590	12/15/2004		EXAMINER	
SPINECOF	•		PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E		
	447 SPRINGFIELD AVENUE SUITES W2-W3			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUMMIT, NJ 07901				3738	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

						75				
		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)		1				
		10/783,29	2	RALPH ET AL.						
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit						
		Brian E Pe		3738						
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	idress					
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS OF THIS OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS OF THE OF THE OF THIS	ON. R 1.136(a). In no ever a reply within the statu riod will apply and will latute, cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tin tory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. communication.					
Status										
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	8 February 200	4.							
,	•	This action is no								
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is									
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposit	ion of Claims									
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.									
Applicat	ion Papers									
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2004 is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country The oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are: a)□ acc the drawing(s) b rrection is require	e held in abeyance. Se ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). njected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).					
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119									
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 										
2) Notice 3) Infor	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/St er No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	ate	⁻ O-152)					

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "138b" and "138d" have been used to designate both radial slots and spiral slots. In Figs. 4b and 4d it appears these reference numbers are pointing to different slots. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 136a, 136b, 136c, 136d. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 7, paragraph [25] lines 1-6, the Brief Description of Figs. 4a-4d improperly describe the figures. In the drawings, the features are actually the reverse of what is described.

On page 8, paragraph [31] line 1 recites a description for Fig. 5a, but is actually describing Fig. 5c.

On page 9, paragraph [32] line 4 and paragraph [33] line 5 reference character "132" has been used to designate both central opening and inner opening respectively.

On page 9, paragraph [34] line 3 and line 4 reference character "132b" has been used to designate both inner edge and inner opening respectively.

On page 10, paragraph [36] lines 3,5,6 reference character "132d" has been used to designate these features: inner edge, inner opening, and center of the element respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harrington (5893889). Fig. 2 shows an artificial intervertebral spacer device with a first

plate member 32 and a second plate member 34. It can also be seen that the second plate surfaces (36, 40 respectively) face away from one another. Additionally, it can be seen that there is a convex element 54 with a curvate volume 50 maintained against the first member by retaining wall 78 and retaining ring 74. Regarding claim 2, it can be construed that the subassembly is a restoring force subassembly since it includes shock absorbers 68,69. With respect to claim 4, it can also be seen that the subassembly comprises a post structure 45 with a ball 46 extending from the second plate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3,5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington '889 in view of Ralph et al. (5989291). Harrington is explained supra. However, Harrington fails to disclose the convex element is a Belleville washer or the post includes a threaded bore to receive a set screw. Ralph et al. teach (Fig. 9) an intervertebral spacer device having a Belleville washer 230 between two plates with a post and ball coupled to the washer and also secured with a set screw 205. Ralph also teaches that the Belleville washer is one of the strongest configurations for a spring, col. 3, lines 58-62. Ralph additionally teaches the set screw locks the post in place, col. 4, lines 44-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute a

Art Unit: 3738

Belleville washer for the convex element and also incorporate a set screw as taught by Ralph et al. with the spacer device of Harrington such that it provides a stronger force restoring subassembly than a shock absorber.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,2,4,5 of copending Application No. 10/781021. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the current application and the '021 application are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 3738

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian E Pellegrino whose telephone number is 571-272-4756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8am to 5:30pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached at 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TC 3700, AU 3738

Primary Examiner

Brian Pellegrino

Buán Pelleguns